



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

What the two nations need is not an governmental alliance, not any fettering of their freedom by military bonds, but a larger friendship, a truer confidence, a more perfect coöperation along all peaceful lines, the absence of jealousy and distrust, the forgetting and forgiving of bye-gones. Such a life as this will strengthen them and make them a mutual support to one another as no alliance of force could ever do. It will awaken no hostility on the part of the other nation. On the contrary, it will provoke a similar spirit among them toward one another and toward the English-speaking peoples. Anglo-Saxondom can thus be an infinite blessing to itself and to all the rest of the world. If John Bright were still living this is the voice we should hear from Birmingham.

### Editorial Notes.

The editor of the London *Herald of Peace* has a word of highly appreciated commendation of the course followed by the American Peace Society during the present crisis. It says:

"The attitude of the American Peace Society in this great crisis is admirable. We congratulate Dr. Trueblood on the calm and high tone of the last (April) issue of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*, and its superiority to the spirit of the hour. The position is a difficult one. It is not easy to make it clearly understood that the Peace Society, either in this country or America (and the two societies are practically identical in basis and constitution), cannot be a political partizan. It exists for a definite object, and in proportion as it is partizan it is disloyal to its own purpose, and so far ineffective. Whereas, if it be true to itself, to its mission, and to the truth for which it testifies, it cannot fail until that has failed. If it becomes the mere repeater of party shibboleths, its work is ended, for that can be done better by other organizations more distinctly political. Political parties and their policies are temporary and fluctuating; the cause represented by the Peace Society is that of the King, and is eternal."

An appeal has been made to the country for the immediate raising of a large relief fund to be spent by the American National Red Cross, for the relief of sick and wounded soldiers during the war. The friends of peace have always been among the foremost to hasten to the relief of those suffering from war. The Red Cross movement was originated by a man who desired to see war abolished, and who, meanwhile, wanted every possible relief and comfort brought to those suffering from its ravages. We need not, therefore, urge our friends to respond to this call, knowing that they will do so of their own accord, according to their ability. Contributions may be sent to the treasurer of the General Committee of the American National Red Cross, Mr. T. D. Tappen, President of the Gallatin National Bank, New York City. Auxiliaries to the Red Cross work are being formed in many places.

The Red Cross is to carry its work of mercy onto the sea. The "*Solace*," an ordinary passenger steamer, has been fitted up for this work. It will follow the destructive war fleets operating about Cuba, and whenever there is a naval engagement, great or small, within its reach, it will gather the wounded from the ships and the drowning from the water. Spain has been informed of the character of the ship, which will carry no guns and will care for the wounded and drowning of both fleets alike. The "*Solace*" has a corps of surgeons, apothecaries, nurses and attendants. It is supplied with medicines, bandages, antiseptics, —everything, in fact, to make it independent of the land. The saloon of the vessel has been changed into an operating room with first-class appliances for surgical work. Eight hundred tons of fresh water are carried in the hold and serve as ballast. An apparatus for making artificial ice is also on board, as also one for turning salt water into fresh water. Swinging beds, made as comfortable as possible by means of springs, are provided, and there is an elevator for carrying wounded men on cots from one deck to another. One part of the vessel is isolated, for those who have contagious diseases.

We all rejoice in the service which the Red Cross renders in saving from death and from much suffering those who have been mangled in battle. It is a work eminently humane and Christian. But how hideous and inhuman war itself seems viewed alongside this work of love and mercy! It is probable that more than fifty millions of dollars have been spent by the Red Cross since its organization. Multitudes of people contribute to its support who will do nothing to support the movement for the abolition of war. Some day the grim incongruity will dawn upon men's minds, and then they will lay hold in solemn earnestness of the work of bringing to an end the whole ghastly business of war, a work inconceivably greater and more blessed than the great and blessed work of the Red Cross.

Much has recently been said, with great show of righteousness, about the sufferings of the non-combatants in Cuba, as if what has been going on there were unknown in what is called "civilized" warfare. Here is an account from a book recently published by a survivor of Grant's Last Campaign, which shows how non-combatants suffered in what has been considered the most righteous war in our century, our civil war:

"They all (the refugees) lived in discomfort. All were utterly poor. It seemed that they were too poor to ever again get a start in life. Their features were as expressionless as wood, their eyes lustreless. I talked to many of these women. All told stories of murder, of arson, of blood-curdling scenes. One told me that before the war she and her husband owned a mountain farm, where they lived in comfort. One day her husband was shot dead as he stood by her side in the door of their

house. She buried him in a grave she dug herself. She and her children tended the crops. These were burned shortly after they gathered them. Then her swine were stolen, and her cows and horse driven off. Finally her oldest son, a boy of fourteen, was shot dead at the spring, and her house and barn were burned in broad daylight, and she and her children were left homeless and without food on a desolate mountain-side. Long before this woman had finished her story she rose to her feet, her face was white with intense passion, her eyes blazed with fire, and her gaunt form quivered with excitement as she gesticulated savagely. She said that if she lived and her boys lived, she would have vengeance on the men who had murdered her husband and son, and destroyed her home. As she talked, so talked all. These women were saturating their children's minds with the stories of the wrongs they had endured. I heard them repeat over and over to their children the names of men which they were never to forget, and whom they were to kill when they had sufficient strength to hold a rifle."

Take the word war to pieces and spell it out in the direct deeds which it commits and the indirect deeds which are always the product of its spirit, and it is always essentially the same, with its endless variations of crime and misery. It can never be otherwise.

Prince Bismarck, as nearly all Continental Europeans, holds the United States responsible for the present war with Spain. In a recent table talk at his home at Friedrichsruhe, he is reported to have condemned the war outright as due to American provocation. He thinks the whole course of our country, in the matter, has been insincere; that the result of the war cannot be wholesome either to America or to Europe; that the United States will be forced to adopt an intermeddling policy, leading to unavoidable frictions; that the abandonment of her traditional peace policy will lead necessarily to her becoming a military and naval power. The main regrettable fact about the war he considers to be America's change of front which means retrogression of civilization.

This opinion, even though coming from a European source, is none the less valuable. It is the opinion held by very many of the best of our American people, whose greatest grief is that our country has deliberately thrown away the greatest opportunity that ever came to it, and hence can never be again, in the eyes of the world, what it has been in the past. Not the least of the misfortunes of the war is the loss by us of the high respect and confidence of Europe hitherto shown us. The feeling in Europe against us does not come really from European sympathy with Spain and the condoning of Spanish misrule and cruelty, but from disappointment that our country has seemingly broken down in its leadership in ideas and methods which were expected by Europeans themselves, tired as most of them are of the great militaristic curse which is upon them, to ultimately bring relief to them from their crushing burdens. Chauvinistic Ameri-

cans may affect not to "care a snap" for European opinion, but this fact, instead of relieving the situation, only makes it the more unpromising. Why talk of these things now, we are asked. Why, for the very evident purpose of keeping as many eyes as possible open to the evil plight into which we have fallen, in order that the forces of recovery may be as numerous and vigorous as they can be made, when the days of destruction are past and the moment for them to reassert their sway comes. Something of the nation's former standing may be recovered. How much, will depend upon the post-bellum faithfulness of the tens of thousands of friends of peace whose silence and inactivity before the war left the war-making elements to push their schemes unmolested.

It is announced that the tribunal which is to adjust the British-Venezuela boundary dispute is to meet in Paris next winter. The case of Venezuela has already been laid before the members of the tribunal and that of Great Britain will be presented in July. The agent of Venezuela before the tribunal will be Dr. Jose Maria de Rojas. He will be assisted in the conduct of Venezuela's case by Ex-President Harrison, as chief counsel, and by Ex-Secretary of the Navy Tracy and Mr. S. Mallet-Prevost, former Secretary of the Venezuelan Commission, as assistant counsel. The four members of the tribunal provided for by the treaty of Washington in 1897, have chosen the distinguished Russian international jurist, Professor de Maartens, as the fifth member of the court.

Something of the enormous and growing burdens of war preparations upon the peoples of Europe may be vividly realized from what F. Marion Crawford has recently said about taxation in Italy. Mr. Crawford, who was born in Italy and owns property there, says that he himself pays, in national, provincial and commercial taxes, 42 per cent upon the assessed income of a few acres of land. On the assessed rent of his house he pays something over 23 per cent. The tax on incomes in Italy is 13½ per cent. There is no limit of estates, real or personal, below which taxation is not applied. In this way he accounts for the enormous immigration from Italy in recent years, which has diminished the farming population and thus crippled agriculture. Immense areas of land have been confiscated by the government for overdue taxes, and under existing circumstances no one would be willing to take these lands even as a gift. Such a condition of things Mr. Crawford considers incipient national bankruptcy.

Loudly as these facts speak, the leaders of no nation pay the least attention to them, so blinded and hardened are they by the war-god. There is no end to the millions that are voted without the least hesitation, when the cry of war necessity is raised. The real interests of the

people, that is, of the country, come in for no consideration at all.

Justin McCarthy, M. P., who is so little of a peace man that he does "not know whether there is a peace society in England at present," has nevertheless, as many of his compatriots in authority have not, some Anglo-Saxon common-sense left in his head. He is not disposed to regard with favor some of England's colonial military enterprises. In a recent article in the *New York Independent* he thus speaks of the Nile expedition and the "wiping out" of the Dervish army by Sir Herbert Kitchener's forces:

"But I do not find myself able to get into any actual raptures over the event. I do not quite know what we are to gain by getting to Khartûm, and I find that most of those who rejoice over the opening of the way there know just as little as I do myself. I do not believe that one Englishman in ten thousand has the faintest idea of what our rulers mean by opening the way to Khartûm. I know that the English public have never been consulted on the subject, and that not one man in ten, even in the House of Commons, has any clear idea as to the real object of our policy in Southern Egypt. Therefore, I find myself a little out of tune with the general rejoicing, and I cannot help thinking of the brave fellows, officers and men, who died to accomplish this triumph, and of their lamenting families at home; and I have not yet had explained to me by any competent authority what are the precise benefits which compensate the nation for this sacrifice of gallant lives. . . . I have often thought of late how much we miss the clear voice and the strong influence of a man like John Bright, who could stand up in the face of a whole impassioned country and condemn a war — any war — which was not shown to be just and necessary. There is no voice now in England like that of Mr. Bright — no voice coming from a really great orator, who ventures to stand up for the gospel of peace. So far as I know, the pulpits of the English State Church have not much concerned themselves of late years about that gospel of peace. Now we get into a war, no one knows why — a war of which all we know is that it certainly is not a war of national defense; and when our brave soldiers win a victory, we are bidden to rejoice; and if any one expresses the slightest doubt as to the occasion for the joy, he is at once set down by the majority of his acquaintances as a Little-Englander, or an Irish Nationalist, or some equally objectionable person. Perhaps the time may come when the memory of Prince Bismarck will be less honored by thoughtful and impartial men for his triumph over Austria and over France than for the noble declaration which he once gave forth, that the Eastern Question was not worth to Prussia the blood of a single Pomerania grenadier."

The trouble in England, as in this country, is not that there is not some great national orator like Bright to lift up his voice against "unjust and unnecessary wars," but that the multitudes of ordinary men who believe that wars are wrong do not lift up *their* voices in favor of peace. The influence of John Bright for peace is dying out in England because the small orators everywhere in the

nation do not do in their sphere what he did in his. If every man who really believes that war is unholy and abominable would seriously take in hand his six nearest neighbors, the goddess of peace would get to her throne much faster than she does.

The death of William Ewart Gladstone has removed from the world the man who in important respects was the foremost man of his time. His long and eminent service in political life, the strength, purity and simplicity of his character, his oratorical greatness, the breadth of his scholarship, the depth, sincerity and fervor of his Christian life, the nature of the causes which he espoused, all combined to give him a distinction falling to the lot of few men in any age. Mr. Gladstone cannot be said to have been a man of original principles and measures. He was a conservative opportunist, though his opportunism usually went to the side of right and good, which he advocated with great power and sincerity. During his earlier life, the peace movement, as advocated by Cobden, Bright and Henry Richard, did not appeal to him very strongly. He had much to do, however, with the development of arbitration between Great Britain and the United States, though he always manifested a certain caution about the subject, even in his speech on the Cremer resolution in June, 1893. Since then the subject, which has in recent years so rapidly come to the front, seems to have constantly taken deeper and deeper hold of him, and during his last weeks the wish for the peace of the world was one of those most continually uppermost in his mind. We cannot forbear to mention in this necessarily brief note what seems to us one of the very greatest acts of statesmanship ever done by Mr. Gladstone. This was his stopping the war with the Boers in South Africa, after the defeat of the English forces in battle, purely on the ground that England was in the wrong and ought not to prosecute the war another step. He ventured, in doing this, to brave the dislike of the English public, which was enthusiastic for the war and not likely to take his act kindly after the humiliation of a British defeat. But, to his lasting honor, he did what was right, and it would be greatly to the credit of statesmen and cabinets everywhere if they would follow his example in similar cases. An unrighteous war can never be made righteous by prosecuting it until victory comes, and no nation can save its honor by continuing to do a wicked thing.

We had not been able to get a copy of the resolution in favor of arbitration passed at the Congress of Mothers recently held in Washington, until the moment of going to press. It was with some difficulty that the subject got any consideration. But the friends of peace in the Congress, supported by the president, insisted that the subject, so germane to the work of women, should not be

crowded out, by reason of the crisis through which the nation is passing. The Countess di Brazza, who represented the American Peace Society as a delegate in the Congress, as well as the Peace and Arbitration Committee of the National Council of Women, of which she is Chairman, did splendid service in helping to hold the Congress true to the high cause of peace in its international as well as in its social and domestic aspects. The resolution is as follows:

"Resolved, that the Second Congress of Mothers proclaims its belief in the brotherhood of man, and that it recommends the settlement of all national and international difficulties by mutual agreement or arbitration, as between the brothers of one universal household."

The French Peace Bureau was founded in December, 1896 and entered upon its work at 6 rue Favart, Paris, in January, 1897. The object of the Bureau is to serve as a bond of union between the peace societies in France, between these societies and the International Peace Bureau at Berne, and in general to promote the peace propaganda. The report of the work of the Bureau for the first year is before us. It covers a pamphlet of twenty-four pages. The Bureau has given its chief attention to the promotion of peace ideas through the general press. It republished the "Appeal to Educators of Youth," prepared by the International Peace Bureau, and sent this to eighty French educational periodicals. Some French papers of a general character have put themselves at the service of the Bureau. The Bureau has commenced the collection of a library of peace literature, both for loaning purposes and for reference.

Hon. Henry U. Johnson of Indiana introduced into the House of Representatives on Monday, May 9th, the following joint resolution for the neutralization of the Hawaiian Islands:

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

That the President of the United States be, and hereby is, authorized and empowered to appoint three commissioners to meet a like number of commissioners appointed on the part of each of the governments of Great Britain, Germany, Russia, France, Austro-Hungary, Italy, Japan and China, to meet at the city of Washington at as early a date as may be practicable, the said commissioners to formulate and consider, and report to their respective governments a plan for the neutralization and independence of the Sandwich Islands and the prevention in the future of any nation taking possession of said islands, either directly or indirectly.

That the sum of \$—be, and the same is hereby, appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of defraying the expenses of the said commission."

The plan for the neutralization of Hawaii has been discussed in private circles for some years, but this is the first effort made to secure Congressional action on the

subject. The strong opposition in both branches of Congress to the scheme of annexation is likely to awaken serious attention to the Johnson resolution as outlining the only method of dealing with the Hawaiian problem in a manner to solve it for all time. It is thought by some that the participation of the United States in the neutralization of the Sandwich Islands would lead to our becoming involved in "entangling alliances" with the nations of the old world, but the advocates of neutralization believe that this is the only way to prevent the Hawaiian problem from bringing us into entangling alliances of a very serious nature.

While we object as seriously as the stoutest advocate of the Monroe doctrine can do to the United States involving herself in any sort of military alliance with the nations of Europe, or with any other, for that matter, we believe that every interest of humanity requires that she should coöperate with them along all peaceful lines. If our country should invite all the great powers to join her in taking such a step as this, it is almost certain that a favorable response would be given, and thus a great step in the way of friendly and purely peaceful international coöperation would have been taken. The Johnson resolution deserves the most careful consideration on the part both of Congress and the people at large.

We take from the *Philadelphia Times* of May 9th, the following note describing an interesting movement among the children of Philadelphia recently set on foot by the Universal Peace Union of that city:

"Yesterday afternoon a meeting was held in Washington Hall, Fourth and South streets, to inaugurate a movement which, it is believed, will result in a very marked beneficial effect among the youth of the neighborhood. The meeting which was under the auspices of the Universal Peace Union, was called for the purpose of organizing the young people, both boys and girls, into small bands, with the object of instilling into their minds the principles of peace and social order, so as to make of them good and useful citizens.

The president of the Peace Union, Alfred H. Love, presided and explained to the three hundred or more children present the object for which they had come together. The Rev. Amanda Deyo, of Dutchess county, New York, also made an address, after which fully half of the children enrolled their names as members of the bands. Others who were present and assisted in the work of organization were Dr. Moses Stearn, the originator of the movement; Thomas J. Whitney and Mrs. Whitney, P. B. Hall, Dr. Sarah T. R. Eavenson, Miss Jane Weedon and Miss Frances Gibson Smith.

The children took hold of the idea very enthusiastically, and it is Dr. Stearn's idea to train them into a realization of the advantages of arbitration in the settlement of their disputes; and through them to reach their parents. The next meeting will be held at the same place on the second Sunday in June."

In his recent address on the Development of the Re-

sources of the Southern States before the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Edward Atkinson spoke thus of war and the militarism of the day:

"In prehistoric times men supplied their wants as the beasts did, by rapine and violence. In these modern days few nations have yet risen above the level of the beasts. Hence war or the preparation for war is the leading occupation of the people of Central Europe. *War is hell.* Militarism, such as rules all Central Europe, is the development of hell upon earth.

Wars of religion (God save the mark!) are over, but the threat of war, owing to the desire to attain the sole control of trade, still degrades nations that are called Christian. The passive war of the military castes, seeking to maintain privileges which are no longer coupled with duties, is ruining nations. If our standing army and navy were equal in ratio to population to those of France and Germany, it would number over nine hundred thousand men. That is about the number in our railway service. Our power of production is plus the nine hundred thousand men in our railway service. The power of production of France and Germany is minus the nine hundred thousand who are wasting their lives in camp and barrack and bringing the people to inevitable bankruptcy, on the lead of Spain which is bankrupt, while Cuba has been desolated through ignorance or neglect of the simplest principles of commerce. We have been free of militarism, let us keep so; then our national taxes may remain as they now are—less than half in money those of the lightest taxed nations in Europe; less than a third in ratio to our greater product."

### Brevities.

Any persons having copies of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE* for March of this year, and not wishing to preserve them, will confer a great favor by sending them to this office.

. . . The Fourth Annual Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration meets, by invitation of Mr. Albert K. Smiley, at Lake Mohonk, N. Y., on the first, second and third days of June. A large number of persons have accepted invitations to the Conference. A report of the proceedings will be given in the July number of the *ADVOCATE OF PEACE*.

. . . The Congregational Mission at San Sebastian, Spain, has been removed across the French border to Biarritz, on account of the war.

. . . The United States Sanitary Commission, an organization of private gentlemen, spent during the Civil War, in money and supplies, about twenty-one millions of dollars in the relief of wounded and sick soldiers.

. . . What a fine-looking thing is war! Yes, disguise it as we may, dress and feather it, daub it with gold, huzza it, and sing swaggering songs about it, what is it nine times out of ten but murder in uniform—Cain taking the sergeant's shilling. — *Douglas Jerrold.*

. . . Overgrown military establishments are under any form of government, inauspicious to liberty, and are particularly hostile to republican liberty.—*George Washington.*

. . . The law of nations is naturally founded on this principle, that different nations ought in time of peace to do one another all the good they can, and in time of war as little harm as possible, without prejudicing their real interests.—*Montesquien's "Spirit of Laws," Vol. I., chap. 3.*

. . . The present debt of Great Britain, nearly all due to wars, amounts to \$3,200,000,000.

. . . The best model is traced by Fenelon, in that sentence which paints his heart: "I prefer my family to myself, my country to my family, mankind to my country."—*Hildreth's "Bentham on Legislation," Vol. II., page 221.*

. . . Mr. George T. Angell, President of the Massachusetts Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, has received a letter from the United States Quartermaster-General, assuring him that animals severely wounded in battle will be promptly and mercifully killed.

. . . During the Franco-Prussian war, thirteen million dollars were contributed to the Red Cross Society for its work, and in the Russo-Turkish war, over seventeen millions. Will some one tell us how many millions, or half-millions, or quarter millions, have been contributed in a whole century to the still more noble work of preventing war?

. . . The Annual meeting of the London Peace Society was held on Tuesday evening, May 17th. We shall hope to have some account of the meeting for our July number.

. . . The war has interfered seriously with ocean travel, as much as fifty per cent. in case of first-class passenger traffic. It is not all a matter of fear of the Spaniards, from whom there is not the least danger as the steamers are all carrying foreign flags. The threatened derangement of the "purse" because of the war is an equally powerful motive for keeping people at home.

. . . War from the private soldier's or sailor's point of view is at best a dull, coarse, squalid business, — a dreary monotony varied by infrequent spasms of intense exertion, excitement, horror, and exultation or dejection. — *President Eliot.*

. . . The expenditures of the government are now exceeding the receipts by nearly one million per day, and the excess is expected to be greater as the volunteers are brought into service.

### Annual Meeting of the American Peace Society.

The Seventieth Annual Business Meeting of the American Peace Society was held in Pilgrim Hall, Congregational House, Boston, Monday, May 9th, at 2.30 P.M.

Hon. Robert Treat Paine, President of the Society, was in the chair.

Rev. Charles G. Ames invoked the divine blessing upon the Society and its work, upon the country, and upon